

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-8 and 10-13 are being amended. Claim 9 is being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claim 14 is being added.

This amendment adds, changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-8 and 10-14 are now pending in this application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0152115 A1 to Morita et al. (hereafter “Morita”).

Independent claim 1 is directed to a system for mediating safe driving information, where the system comprises safe driving detecting terminals, user’s safety confirming terminals, and a safe driving information mediating apparatus. The system for mediating the safe driving information “judges whether or not said specified vehicle is running in a safe driving state, and then, depending on the judging, supplies either a message of the occurrence of an abnormal driving state to a user’s safety confirming terminal in a predetermined contact address when the abnormal driving state of said vehicle is confirmed, or a message of the safe driving of said vehicle to said user’s safety confirming terminal when the safe driving of said vehicle is confirmed and when a request of confirming the safe driving is received from said predetermined contact address.” Morita fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature of claim 1 of “depending on the judging, supplies either a message of the occurrence of an abnormal driving state to a user’s safety confirming terminal in a predetermined contact address when the abnormal driving state of said vehicle is confirmed, or a message of the safe driving of said vehicle to said user’s safety confirming terminal when the safe driving of said

vehicle is confirmed and when a request of confirming the safe driving is received from said predetermined contact address.”

Morita discloses a vehicle managing method and system. Morita discloses an embodiment in Figure 10 including a satellite 1 that uplinks information 5, where the information may include emergency information, such as accident information, and downlinks information to an information management system 13 (paragraph [0070]). The information management system 13 distributes the information to information requiring parties such as safety information to party 18, which may be an insurance company, or other information to party 16 (paragraph [0070]).

The Office Action equates the requiring parties 16 and 18 with the “user’s safety confirming terminals” as claimed. Morita, however, does not disclose or suggest that depending on a judging of whether or not a specified vehicle is running in a safe driving state, supplying to the parties 16 or 18 either: (1) a message of the occurrence of an abnormal driving state in a predetermined contact address when an abnormal driving state of the vehicle is confirmed, or (2) a message of the safe driving of the vehicle when the safe driving of the vehicle is confirmed and when a request of confirming the safe driving is received from the predetermined contact address. While Morita discloses sending safety information from information management system 13 to party 18 (an insurance company), Morita does not disclose or suggest that depending on judging whether or not a vehicle is in a safe driving state, supplying to the insurance company (1) a message of the occurrence of an abnormal driving state or (2) a message of the safe driving of the vehicle when a request of confirming the safe driving is requested. Morita simply does not suggest supplying the alternative messages as recited in claim 1 depending on the results of the judging step as recited. Moreover, Morita does not disclose that the insurance company of party 18 requests a confirmation of safe driving of any vehicle. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Morita.

Independent claims 10-13 are patentable for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims 2-8 and 14 ultimately depend from claim 1, and are patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, claim 14 recites "wherein the users possessing the user's safety confirming terminals are the families of the drivers of the vehicles."

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 28, 2005

By William T. Ellis

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438